arXiv:1701.07660v1 [math.PR] 26 Jan 2017

Variations on branching methods for non linear PDEs

Xavier Warin *

January 27, 2017

Abstract

The branching methods developed in [9], [11] are effective methods to solve some semi linear PDEs and are shown numerically to be able to solve some full non linear PDEs. These methods are however restricted to some small coefficients in the PDE and small maturities. This article shows numerically that these methods can be adapted to solve the problems with longer maturities in the semi-linear case by using a new derivation scheme and some nested method. As for the case of full non linear PDEs, we introduce new schemes and we show numerically that they provide an effective alternative to the schemes previously developed.

1 Introduction

The resolution of low dimensional non linear PDEs is often achieved by some deterministic methods such as finite difference schemes, finite elements and finite volume. Due the curse of dimensionality, these methods cannot be used in dimension greater than three : both the computer time and the memory required are too large even for supercomputers. In the recent years the probabilistic community has developed some representation of semi linear PDE:

$$-\partial_t u - \mathcal{L}u = f(u, Du), \qquad u_T = g, \qquad t < T,\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1.1)$$

by means of backward stochastic differential equations (BSDE), as introduced by [13]. Numerical Monte Carlo algorithms have been developed to solve efficiently these BSDE by [2], [14]. The representation of the following full non linear PDE:

$$-\partial_t u - \mathcal{L}u = f(u, Du, D^2u), \qquad u_T = g, \qquad t < T,\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1.2)$$

has been given by the mean of second order backward stochastic differential equation (SOBSDE) by [4]. A numerical algorithm developed by [6] has been derived to solve these full non linear PDE by the mean of SOBSEs.

The BSDE and SOBSDE schemes developed rely on the approximation of conditional

*EDF R&D & FiME, Laboratoire de Finance des Marchés de l'Energie, xavier.warin@edf.fr

expectation and the most effective implementation is based on regression methods as developed in [8], [12]. These regression methods develop an approximation of conditional expectations based on an expansion on basis functions. The size of this expansion has to grow exponentially with the dimension of the problem so we have to face again the curse of dimensionality. Notice that the BSDE methodology could be used in dimension 4 or 5 as regressions has been successfully used in dimension 6 in [3] using some local regression function.

Recently a new representation of semi linear equations (1.1) for a polynomial function f of u and Du has been given by [9] : this representation uses the automatic differentiation approximation as used in [7], [1], [10], and [5]. The authors have shown that the representation gives a finite variance estimator only for small maturities or small non linearities and numerical examples until dimension 10 are given. Besides, they have shown that the given scheme using Malliavin weights cannot be used to solve the full non linear equation (1.2).

[11] have introduced a re-normalization technique improving numerically the convergence of the scheme diminishing the variance observed for the semi linear case. Besides, the authors haved introduced a scheme to solve the full non linear equation (1.2). Without proof of convergence they numerically have shown that the developed scheme is effective.

The aim of the paper is to provide some numerical variation on the algorithm developed in [9, 11]. In a first part we will show, with simple ideas, that it is possible to deal with longer maturities than the ones possible with the initial algorithm.

In a second part we give some alternative schemes to the one proposed in [11] and, testing them on some numerical examples, we show that they are superior than the scheme previously developed.

In the numerical results presented in the article, all errors are estimated as the log of the standard deviation observed divided by the square root of the number of particles used and these errors are plotted as a function of the log of the number of particles used. As our methods are pure Monte Carlo methods we expect to have lines with slope $-\frac{1}{2}$ when the numerical variance is bounded.

2 The Semi Linear case

Let $\sigma_0 \in \mathbb{S}^d$ be some constant non-degenerate matrix, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be some constant vector $f : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, and $g : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ bounded Lipschitz functions, we consider the semi linear parabolic PDE:

$$\partial_t u + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_0\sigma_0^\top : D^2u + \mu.Du + f(\cdot, u, Du) = 0, \quad \text{on } [0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{2.1}$$

with terminal condition $u(T,\cdot) = g(\cdot)$ where $A : B := \text{Trace}(AB^\top)$ for two matrices A, $B \in \mathbb{M}^d$.

When f is a polynomial in (u, Du) in the form

$$f(t,x,y,z,\gamma) \ = \sum_{\ell=(\ell_0,\ell_1,\cdot,\ell_m)\in L} c_\ell(t,x) y^{\ell_0} \prod_{i=1}^{m} (b_i \cdot z)^{\ell_i},$$

for some $m \geq 1$, $L \subset \mathbb{N}^{1+m}$, where $(b_i)_{i=1,m}$ is a sequence of $\mathbb{R}^d-$valued bounded continuous functions defined on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and $(c_\ell)_{\ell\in L}$ is a sequence of bounded continuous functions defined on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. [9] obtained a probabilistic representation to the above PDE by branching diffusion processes under some technical conditions. In the sequel, we simplify the setting by taking f as a constant (in u, Du) plus a monomial in u, $(b_i.Du)$, $i = 1, m$:

$$f(t,x,y,z) \ = h(t,x) + c(t,x) y^{\ell_0} \prod_{i=1}^{m} (b_i \cdot z)^{\ell_i}, \tag{2.2}$$

for some $m \geq 1$, where $(b_i)_{i=1,m}$ is a sequence of $\mathbb{R}^d-$valued bounded continuous function defined on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $(\ell_i)_{i=0,m} \in \mathbb{N}^{m+1}$ supposing that $\sum_{i=0,m} \ell_i > 0$, and c is a bounded continuous function defined on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. We note $L = \sum_{i=0}^{m} \ell_i$.

Remark 2.1. *The case with f a general polynomial only complexifies the notation : it can be simply treated as in [9] by introducing some probability mass function $(p_\ell)_{\ell\in L}$ (i.e. $p_\ell \geq 0$ and $\sum_{\ell\in L} p_\ell = 1$) that are used to select with monomial to consider during the branching procedure. Another approach can be used : instead of sampling the monomial to use, it is possible to consider successively all terms of the f but this doesn't give a representation as nice as the one in [9].*

2.1 Variation on the original scheme of [9]

In this section we present the original scheme of [9] and explain how to diminish the variance increase the maturities of the problem.

2.1.1 The branching process

Let us first introduce a branching process with arrival time of distribution density function ρ. At the arrival time, the particle branches into $|\ell|$ offsprings. We introduce a sequence of i.i.d. positive random variables $(\tau^k)_{k=(k_1,\cdots,k_{n-1},k_n)\in\mathbb{N}^n, n>1}$ with all the values $k_i \in [1, L]$, for $i > 0$.
We construct an age-dependent branching process using the following procedure :

1. We start from a particle marked by 0, indexed by (1), of generation 1, whose arrival time is given by $T_{(1)} := \tau^{(1)} \wedge T$.
2. Let $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_{n-1}, k_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ be a particle of generation n, with arrival time T_k that branches into L offspring particles noted $(k_1, \cdots, k_{n-1}, k_n, i)$ for $i = 1, ..., L$. We define the set of its offspring particles by

$$S(k) := \{(k_1, \cdots, k_n, 1), \cdots, (k_1, \cdots, k_n, L)\},$$

We first mark the ℓ_0 particles by 0, the ℓ_1 next by 1 , and so on, so that each particle has a mark i for $i = 0, \cdots, m$.

3. For a particle $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n, k_{n+1})$ of generation $n+1$, we denote by $k- := (k_1, \cdots, k_n)$ the "parent" particle of k, and the arrival time of k is given by $T_k := \big(T_{k-} + \tau^k\big) \wedge T$. Let us denote $\Delta T_k = T_k - T_{k-}$.
4. In particular, for a particle $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n)$ of generation n, and T_{k-} is its birth time and also the arrival time of $k-$. Moreover, for the initial particle $k = (1)$, one has $k- = \emptyset$, and $T_\emptyset = 0$.

We denote further

$$\theta_k := \text{mark of } k, \quad \mathcal{K}_t^n := \begin{cases} \big\{k \text{ of generation } n \text{ s.t. } T_{k-} \le t < T_k\big\}, & \text{when } \ t \in [0, T), \\ \{k \text{ of generation } n \text{ s.t. } T_k = T\}, & \text{when } \ t = T, \end{cases}$$

and also

$$\overline{\mathcal{K}}_t^n := \cup_{s \le t} \mathcal{K}_s^n, \quad \mathcal{K}_t := \cup_{n \ge 1} \mathcal{K}_t^n \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\mathcal{K}}_t := \cup_{n \ge 1} \overline{\mathcal{K}}_t^n.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{K}_t$ (resp. $\mathcal{K}_t^n$) denotes the set of all living particles (resp. of generation n) in the system at time t, and $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_t$ (resp. $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_t^n$) denotes the set of all particles (resp. of generation n) being alive at or before time t.

We next equip each particle with a Brownian motion in order to define a branching Brownian motion. Let $(\hat{W}^k)_{k=(k_1,\cdots,k_{n-1},k_n)\in\mathbb{N}^n, n>1}$ be a sequence of independent d-dimensional Brownian motion, which is also independent of $(\tau^k)_{k=(k_1,\cdots,k_{n-1},k_n)\in\mathbb{N}^n,n>1}$. Define $W_t^{(1)} = \hat{W}_t^{(1)}$ for all $t \in \big[0, T_{(1)}\big]$ and then for each $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n) \in \overline{\mathcal{K}}_T \setminus \{(1)\}$, define

$$W_t^k \ := \ W_{T_{k-}}^{k-} + \hat{W}_{t-T_{k-}}^k, \quad \text{for all } t \in [T_{k-}, T_k]. \tag{2.3}$$

Then $(W_\cdot^k)_{k \in \overline{\mathcal{K}}_T}$ is a branching Brownian motion.

2.1.2 The original algorithm

Let us denote $\bar{F}(t) := \int_t^\infty \rho(s) ds$. Denoting $X_t^k := x + \mu t + \sigma_0 W_t^k$ for all $k \in \overline{\mathcal{K}}_T$ and $t \in [T_{k-}, T_k]$ and by $\mathbb{E}_{t,x}$ the expectation operator conditional on the starting data $X_t = x$ at time t, we obtain from the Feynman-Kac formula the representation of the solution u of equation (2.1) as:

$$u(0,x) = \mathbb{E}_{0,x}\Big[\bar{F}(T)\frac{g(X_T)}{\bar{F}(T)} + \int_0^T \frac{f(u, Du)(t, X_t)}{\rho(t)} \rho(t) dt\Big] = \mathbb{E}_{0,x}\big[\phi\big(T_{(1)}, X_{T_{(1)}}^{(1)}\big)\big], \tag{2.4}$$

where $T_{(1)} := \tau^{(1)} \wedge T$, and

$$\phi(t,y) := \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{t \ge T\}}}{\bar{F}(T)} g(y) + \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{t<T\}}}{\rho(t)} (h + c u^{\ell_0} \prod_{i=1}^m (b_i \cdot Du)^{\ell_i})(t,y). \tag{2.5}$$

On the event $\{\mathbf{1}_{\{T_{(1)}<T\}}\}$, using the independence of the (τ^k, W^k) we are left to calculate

$$[cu^{\ell_0}\prod_{i=1}^{m}(b_i\cdot Du)^{\ell_i}](T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}) = c\prod_{j=1}^{\ell_0}\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[\phi\big(T_{(1,j)},X^{(1)}_{T_{(1,j)}}\big)\big]$$
$$\prod_{i=1}^{m}(b_i(T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}).D\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[\phi\big(T_{(1,p)},X^{(1,p)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)\big])^{\ell_i} \tag{2.6}$$

Using differentiation with respect to the heat kernel, i.e. the marginal density of the Brownian motion we get :

$$[cu^{\ell_0}\prod_{i=1}^{m}(b_i\cdot Du)^{\ell_i}](T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}) = c\prod_{j=1}^{\ell_0}\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[\phi\big(T_{(1,j)},X^{(1,j)}_{T_{(1,j)}}\big)\big]$$
$$\prod_{i=1}^{m}(b_i(T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}).\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[(\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\frac{\hat{W}^{(1,p)}_{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}}{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}\phi\big(T_{(1,p)},X^{(1,p)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)\big])^{\ell_i} \tag{2.7}$$

Using equations (2.4) and (2.7) recursively and the tower property , we get the following representation

$$u(0,x) = \mathbb{E}_{0,x}\Big[\widehat{\psi}_{(1)}\Big] \tag{2.8}$$

where $\widehat{\psi}_{(1)}$ is given by the backward recursion : let $\widehat{\psi}_k := \frac{g(X^k_T)-g(X^k_{T_{k-}})\mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_k\neq 0\}}}{\overline{F}(\Delta T_k)}$ for every $k\in\mathcal{K}_T$, then let

$$\widehat{\psi}_k \;:=\; \frac{1}{\rho(\Delta T_k)}\big(h(T_k,X^k_{T_k})+c(T_k,X^k_{T_k})\prod_{\tilde{k}\in S(k)}\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}}\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{k}}\big),\qquad \text{for } k\in\overline{\mathcal{K}}_T\setminus\mathcal{K}_T. \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$\mathcal{W}_k \;=\; \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_k=0\}} \;+\; \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_k\neq 0\}}\;\frac{b_{\theta_k}(T_{k-},X^k_{T_{k-}})\cdot(\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\hat{W}^k_{\Delta T_k}}{\Delta T_k}. \tag{2.10}$$

and we have used that $\mathbb{E}_{0,x}\big[g(X^k_{T_{k-}})b_{\theta_k}(T_{k-},X^k_{T_{k-}})\cdot\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\hat{W}^k_{\Delta T_k}\big]=0$. This backward representation is slightly different from the elegant representation introduced in [9]. Clearly on our case the variance of the method used will be lower than with the representation in [9] for a similar computational cost.

In the case where the operator f is linear and a function of the gradient ($\ell_0=0$, $m=1$ and $\ell_1=1$) using the arguments in [5] it can be easily seen by conditioning with respect to the number of branching that equation (2.8) is of finite variance if $\frac{1}{x\rho(x)^2}=O(x^\alpha)$ as $x\longrightarrow 0$ with $\alpha\geq 0$.
When τ follows for example a gamma law with parameters κ and θ, the finite variance is proved as soon as $\kappa\leq 0.5$ for PDE coefficients and maturities small enough.
In the non linear case, [9] have shown that the variance is in fact finite for maturities

small enough and small coefficients as soon as $\kappa < 0.5$ but numerical results show that $\kappa = 0.5$ is optimal in term of efficiency: for a given θ the numerical variance is nearly the same for the values of κ between 0.4 and 0.5 but a higher κ value limits the number of branching thus meaning a smaller computational cost.

2.1.3 Variation on the original scheme

As indicated in the introduction, the method is restricted to small maturities or small non linearities. Having a given non linearity we are interested in adapting the methodology in order to be able to treat longer maturities. A simple idea consists in noting that the Monte Carlo method is applied by sampling the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_{t,x}$ for $t > 0$ appearing in equation (2.7) only once. Using nested Monte Carlo, so by sampling each term of equation (2.7) more that one time one can expect a reduction in the variance observed. A nested method of order n is defined as a method using n sampling to estimate each function u or Du at each branching. Of course the computational time will grow exponentially with the number of samples taken and for example trying to use a gamma law with a non linearity of Burger's type $u(b.Du)$ with $\kappa = 0.5$ is very costly: due to the high values of the density ρ near 0, trajectories can have many branching.
Some different strategies have been tested to be able to use this technique :

- A first possibility consists in trying to re-sample more at the beginning of the resolution and decreasing the number of samples as time goes by or as the number of branching increases. The methodology works slightly better than a re-sampling with a constant number of particles but has to be adapted to each maturity and each case so it has been given up.
- Another observation is that the gamma law is only necessary to treat the gradient term: so it is possible to use two laws: a first one, an exponential law, will be used to estimate the u function while an gamma law will be used for the Du terms. This second technique is the most effective and is used for the results obtained in the section.

For a given dimension d , we take $\sigma_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\mathbf{I}_d$, $\mu = \mathbf{0}$,

$$f(t, x, y, z) = d(t, x) + y(b \cdot z),$$

where $b := \frac{0.2}{d}(1 + \frac{1}{d}, 1 + \frac{2}{d}, \cdots, 2)$ and

$$h(t, x) := \cos(x_1 + \cdots + x_d)\Big(\alpha + \frac{\sigma_0^2}{2} + c\sin(x_1 + \cdots + x_d)\frac{3d + 1}{2d}e^{\alpha(T-t)}\Big)e^{\alpha(T-t)}.$$

With terminal condition $g(x) = \cos(x_1 + \cdots + x_d)$, the explicit solution of semi linear PDE (2.1) is given by

$$u(t, x) = \cos(x_1 + \cdots + x_d)e^{\alpha(T-t)}.$$

Our goal is to estimate u at $t = 0$, $x = 0.5\mathbf{1}$. This test case will be noted test A in the sequel.
We use the nested algorithm with two distributions for τ:

- an exponential law with density $\rho(s) = \lambda e^{-\lambda s}$ with $\lambda = 0.4$ to calculate the u terms,
- a gamma distribution $\rho(s) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\kappa)\theta^\kappa} s^{\kappa-1} \exp(-s/\theta)\mathbf{1}_{\{s>0\}}$ with $\Gamma(\kappa) := \int_0^\infty s^{\kappa-1}e^{-s}ds$ and the parameters $\kappa = 0.5$, $\frac{1}{\theta} = 0.4$ to calculate the Du terms.

We first give on figures 1, 2 and 3 the results obtained for test A for different maturities and a dimension $d = 4$ so the analytical solution is -0.508283. We plot for each maturity :

- the solution obtained by increasing the number of Monte Carlo scenarios used,
- the error calculated as explained in the introduction.

Nested n curves stand for the curves using the nested method of order n, so the Nested 1 curve stands for the original method.



Figure 1: Estimation and error in $d = 4$ on case test A. Maturity $T = 1$.



Figure 2: Estimation and error in $d = 4$ on case test A. Maturity $T = 1.5$

On figure 3, for maturity 2.5 the error observed with the orignal method (Nested 1) is around 1000 so it has not been plotted.



Figure 3: Error in $d = 4$ on case test A. Maturity $T = 2.$, $T = 2.5$

Because of the number of branching due to the gamma law, it seems difficult to use a nested method of order $n > 2$ for long maturities : the time needed explodes. But clearly the nested method permits to have accurate solution for longer maturities.

For a maturity of 2 we also give the results obtained in dimension 6 on figure 4 giving an analytical solution -1.4769 : once again the original method fails to converge while the nested one give good results.



Figure 4: Estimation and error in $d = 6$ on case test A. Maturity $T = 2$.

2.2 Adaptation of the original branching to the re-normalization technique

As introduced in [11], we introduce a modification of the original branching process that let us use exponential laws for the branching dates to treat the Du terms in the method previously described. Recall that $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_T^1 = \{(1)\}$, we introduce an associated ghost particle, denoted by (1^1), and denote $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^1 := \{(1), (1^1)\}$. Next, given the collection $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^n$ of all particles (as well as ghost particles) of generation n, we define the collection $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^{n+1}$ as

follows. For every $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}^n$, we denote by $o(k) = (\hat{k}_1, \cdots, \hat{k}_n)$ its original particles, where $\hat{k}_i := j$ when $k_i = j$ or j^1. Further, when $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n)$ is such that $k_n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote $k^1 := (k_1, \cdots, k_{n-1}, k_n^1)$. The mark of $k \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}^n$ will be the same as its original particle $o(k)$, i.e. $\theta_k := \theta_{o(k)}$; and $T_k := T_{o(k)}$, $\Delta T_k := \Delta T_{o(k)}$ and $\tau^k = \tau^{o(k)}$. Define also $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T^n := \{k \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^n \ : o(k) \in \mathcal{K}_T\}$. For every $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^n \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T^n$, we still define the set of its offspring particles by

$$S(k) := \{(k_1, \cdots, k_n, 1), \cdots, (k_1, \cdots, k_n, L)\},$$

and the set of ghost offspring particles by

$$S^1(k) \ := \ \big\{(k_1, \cdots, k_n, 1^1), \cdots, (k_1, \cdots, k_n, L^1)\big\}.$$

Then the collection $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^{n+1}$ of all particles (and ghost particles) of generation $n+1$ is

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^{n+1} \ := \ \cup_{k \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^n \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T^n} \big(S(k) \cup S^1(k)\big).$$

Define also

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T := \cup_{n \geq 1} \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^n, \quad \text{and } \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T := \cup_{n \geq 1} \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T^n.$$

2.2.1 The original re-normalization technique

We next equip each particle with a Brownian motion in order to define a branching Brownian motion. Further, let $W_0^{\emptyset} := 0$, and for every $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^n$, let

$$W_s^k \ := \ W_{T_{k-}}^{k-} \ + \ \mathbf{1}_{k_n \in \mathbb{N}} \hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k)}, \quad \text{and} \quad X_s^k := \mu s + \sigma_0 W_s^k, \quad \forall s \in [T_{k-}, T_k]. \quad (2.11)$$

On figure 5, we give the original Galton-Watson tree and the ghost particles associated.



(a) Original Galton-Watson tree

$W^{(1)} = \hat{W}^{(1)}$
$W^{(1,1)} = \hat{W}^{(1)} + \hat{W}^{(1,1)}$
$W^{(1,2)} = \hat{W}^{(1)} + \hat{W}^{(1,2)}$
$W^{(1,1,1)} = \hat{W}^{(1)} + \hat{W}^{(1,1)} + \hat{W}^{(1,1,1)}$
$W^{(1,1,2)} = \hat{W}^{(1)} + \hat{W}^{(1,1)} + \hat{W}^{(1,1,2)}$



(b) Tree with ghost particle $k = (1, 1^1)$

$W^{(1)} = \hat{W}^{(1)}$
$W^{(1,1^1)} = \hat{W}^{(1)}$
$W^{(1,2)} = \hat{W}^{(1)} + \hat{W}^{(1,2)}$
$W^{(1,1^1,1)} = \hat{W}^{(1)} + \hat{W}^{(1,1,1)}$
$W^{(1,1^1,2)} = \hat{W}^{(1)} + \hat{W}^{(1,1,2)}$



(c) Tree with ghost particle $k = (1^1)$

$W^{(1^1)} = 0$
$W^{(1^1,1)} = \hat{W}^{(1,1)}$
$W^{(1^1,2)} = \hat{W}^{(1,2)}$
$W^{(1^1,1,1)} = \hat{W}^{(1,1)} + \hat{W}^{(1,1,1)}$
$W^{(1^1,1,2)} = \hat{W}^{(1,1)} + \hat{W}^{(1,1,2)}$



(d) Tree with ghost particles $k = (1^1)$ and $k = (1^1, 1^1)$

$W^{(1^1)} = 0$
$W^{(1^1,1^1)} = 0$
$W^{(1^1,2)} = \hat{W}^{(1,2)}$
$W^{(1^1,1^1,1)} = \hat{W}^{(1,1,1)}$
$W^{(1^1,1^1,2)} = \hat{W}^{(1,1,2)}$

Figure 5: Original Galton-Watson tree, different trees with ghost particles (excluding ghost particles at the extreme leaves) for a Brownian motion where W^k stands for $W^k_{T_k}$ and $\hat{W}^k$ stands for $\hat{W}^k_{\Delta T_k}$.

The initial equation (2.4) remains unchanged (first step of the algorithm) but equation (2.7) is modified by replacing the term

$$\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[(\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\frac{\hat{W}^{(1,p)}_{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}}{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}\phi\big(T_{(1,p)},X^{(1,p)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)\big]$$

by

$$\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[(\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\frac{\hat{W}^{(1,p)}_{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}}{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}\big(\phi\big(T_{(1,p)},X^{(1,p)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)-\phi\big(T_{(1,p)},X^{(1,p^1)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)\big)\big]. \tag{2.12}$$

Notice that since $W^{(1,p^1)}$ has been obtained by (2.11), $\hat{W}^{(1,p)}_{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}$ and $\phi\big(T_{(1,p)},W^{(1,p^1)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)$ are orthogonal so that adding the second term acts as a control variate. Recursively using the modified version of equation (2.7) induced by the use of (2.12), [11] gave

defined the re-normalized estimator by a backward induction: let $\widehat{\psi}_k := \frac{g(X_T^k)}{\overline{F}(\Delta T_k)}$ for every $k \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T$, then let

$$\widehat{\psi}_k := \frac{1}{\rho(\Delta T_k)}\big(h(T_k, X^k_{T_k}) + c(T_k, X^k_{T_k}) \prod_{\tilde{k}\in S(k)} \big(\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}} - \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\theta(\tilde{k})\neq 0\}}\big)\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{k}}\big), \quad \text{for } k \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T. \tag{2.13}$$

where the weights are given by equation (2.10), so we have

$$u(0,x) = \mathbb{E}_{0,x}\Big[\widehat{\psi}_{(1)}\Big].$$

As explained in section 2.1.2, equation (2.7) used in representation (2.8) force us to take laws for branching dates with a high probability of low values that leads to a high number of recursions defined by equation (2.9). Besides such laws using some rejection algorithm, as gamma laws, are very costly to generate. The use of (2.12) permits us to use exponential laws very cheap to simulate and with a low probability of small values.
Indeed it can be easily seen in the linear case (f function of the gradient with $\ell_0 = 0$, $m = 1$ and $\ell_1 = 1$) by conditioning with respect to the number of branching that the variance is bounded for small maturities and coefficients if

$$\mathbb{E}_{0,x}\big[\big(\widehat{\psi}_k - \widehat{\psi}_{k^1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\theta(k)\neq 0\}}\big)^2 \frac{\Big(b_{\theta_k}(T_{k-}, X^k_{T_{k-}}) \cdot (\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\hat{W}^{o(k)}_{\Delta T_k}\Big)^2}{(\Delta T_k)^2}\big] < \infty. \tag{2.14}$$

By $X_t^{k^1}$ construction using g regularity, it is easily seen that for small time steps ΔT_k, $\mathbb{E}_{0,x,\Delta T_k}\big[(\widehat{\psi}_k - \widehat{\psi}_{k^1})^2\big] = O(\Delta T_k)$ as $\Delta T_k \longrightarrow 0$ and (2.14) is satisfied for every ρ densities.

2.2.2 Re-normalization techniques and antithetic

We give a version of the re-normalization technique using antithetic variables. Equation (2.11) is modified by :

$$\begin{aligned} W_s^k \;:=\; & W^{k-}_{T_{k-}} \;+\; \mathbf{1}_{k_n\in\mathbb{N}}\hat{W}^{o(k)}_{s-T_{k-}} \;-\; \mathbf{1}_{k_n\notin\mathbb{N}}\hat{W}^{o(k)}_{s-T_{k-}}, \\ & \text{and} \;\; X_s^k := \mu s + \sigma_0 W_s^k, \quad \forall s \in [T_{k-}, T_k], \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

for every $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^n$.
Then equation (2.7) is modified by :

- First , replacing the term tacking into account the power of u

  $$\phi\big(T_{(1,j)}, X^{(1,j)}_{T_{(1,j)}}\big)$$

  by

  $$\frac{1}{2}\big(\phi\big(T_{(1,j)}, X^{(1,j)}_{T_{(1,j)}}\big) + \phi\big(T_{(1,j)}, X^{(1,j^1)}_{T_{(1,j)}}\big)\big),$$

- and the term taking into account the gradient

$$\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[(\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\frac{\hat{W}^{(1,p)}_{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}}{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}\phi\big(T_{(1,p)},X^{(1,p)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)\big]$$

by

$$\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[(\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\frac{\hat{W}^{(1,p)}_{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}}{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}\frac{1}{2}\big(\phi\big(T_{(1,p)},X^{(1,p)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)-\phi\big(T_{(1,p)},X^{(1,p^1)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)\big)\big].$$

Notice that with this version the variance of the gradient term is finite with the same argument as in the original re-normalization version in subsection 2.2.1.
By backward induction we get the re-normalized antithetic estimator modifying (2.13) by:

$$\widehat{\psi}_k := \frac{1}{\rho(\Delta T_k)}\big(h(T_k,X^k_{T_k})+c(T_k,X^k_{T_k})\prod_{\tilde{k}\in S(k)}\frac{1}{2}\big(\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}}-\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\theta(\tilde{k})\neq 0\}}+\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\theta(\tilde{k})=0\}}\big)\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{k}}\big),$$

for $k\in\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T$. (2.16)

where the weights are given by equation (2.10). Then we have

$$u(0,x)=\mathbb{E}_{0,x}\Big[\widehat{\psi}_{(1)}\Big].$$

2.2.3 Numerical result for semi linear with re-normalization

We apply our nested algorithm on the original re-normalized technique and on the re-normalization technique with antithetic variables on two test cases.
First we give some results for test case A in dimension 4. We give the Monte Carlo error obtained by the nested method on figure 7. For the maturity $T=3$, without nesting the error of the original re-normalization technique has an order of magnitude of 2000 so the curve has not been given. For the maturity $T=4$, the nested original re-normalization technique with an order 2 doesn't seem to converge.



Figure 6: Error in $d = 4$ on case test A for different maturities

As the maturity increases, nesting with a higher order becomes necessary. Notice that with the re-normalization it is possible to use the nested method of a high order because of the small number of branching used. For example, for $T = 2$, for an accuracy of 0.0004, in dimension $d = 4$:

- the original method in section 2.1.2 with a nested method of order 2 achieves an accuracy of 0.0004 for a CPU time of 1500 seconds using 28 cores,
- the re-normalized version of section 2.2.1 with a nested method of order 4 reaches the same accuracy in 1800 seconds,
- the re-normalized version with antithetic of section 2.2.2 without nesting reaches the same accuracy in 11 seconds.

For the same test case A we plot in dimension 6 the error on figure 9 to show that the method converges in high dimension.



Figure 7: Error in $d = 6$ on case test A for $T = 3$.

Besides on figure 8, we show that the derivative is accurately calculated.



Figure 8: Error in $d = 6$ for the term $b.Du$ on case test A for $T = 1.5$.

We then use a second test case B : For a given dimension d , we take $\sigma_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\mathbf{I}_d$, $\mu = \mathbf{0}$,

$$f(t, x, y, z) = \frac{0.1}{d}(\mathbf{1} \cdot z)^2$$

with a terminal condition $g(x) = \cos(x_1 + \cdots + x_d)$. This test case cannot be solve by the nested method without re-normalization due to the high cost involved by the potential high number of branching. We give the results obtained for case B by the re-normalization methods of section 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 in dimension 4 on figure 9.



Figure 9: Error in $d = 4$ on case test B for different maturities.

At last we give the results obtained in dimension 6 pour $T = 1.5$ and $T = 3$ on figure 10.



Figure 10: Error in $d = 6$ on case test B for different maturities.

The nested method with re-normalization and antithetic appears to be the most effective and permits to solve semi-linear equations with quite long maturities. The re-normalization technique is however far more memory consuming than the original scheme of section 2.1.2. This memory cost explodes with very high maturities. The nested version of the original scheme of section 2.1.2 isn't affected by these mem-

ory problems but is affected by an explosion of the computational time with longer maturities.

2.3 Extension to variable coefficients

In the case of time and space dependent coefficients μ and σ_0 of the PDE, it is possible to use the method consisting in "freezing" the coefficients first proposed in [10] for non fixed μ and extended in the general case in [5]. This method increases the variance of the estimator, therefore it is more efficient for treating log maturities to use an Euler scheme to take into account the variation of the coefficients. Introducing an Euler time step δt, between the dates T_{k-} and T_k, the SDE is discretized as :

$$\begin{aligned}
X^k_{T_{k-}+i\delta t} =& X^k_{T_{k-}+(i-1)\delta t} + \mu(T_{k-} + (i-1)\delta t, X^k_{T_{k-}+(i-1)\delta t})\delta t + \\
& \sigma_0(T_{k-} + (i-1)\delta t, X^k_{T_{k-}+(i-1)\delta t})\hat{W}^{k,i}_{\delta t}, \text{ for } i = 1, .., N, \\
X^k_{T_k} =& X^k_{T_{k-}+N\delta t} + \mu(T_{k-} + N\delta t, X^k_{T_{k-}+N\delta t})(\Delta T_k - N\delta t) + \\
& \sigma_0(T_{k-} + N\delta t, X^k_{T_{k-}+N\delta t})\hat{W}^{k,i}_{\Delta T_k - N\delta t},
\end{aligned}$$

where $N = \lfloor \frac{\Delta T_k}{\delta t} \rfloor$, and $(\hat{W}^{k,i})_{k=(k_1,\cdots,k_{n-1},k_n)\in\mathbb{N}^n, n>1, i\geq 1}$ is a sequence of independent d-dimensional Brownian motion.
Using an integration by part on the first time step, in the original scheme of section 2.1, the gradient term in equation (2.7) is replaced

$$\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\left[(\sigma_0(T_{(1)}, X^{(1)}_{T_{(1)}})^\top)^{-1}\frac{\hat{W}^{(1,p),1}_{\min(\delta t,\Delta T_{(1,p)})}}{\min(\delta t, \Delta T_{(1,p)})}\phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X^{(1,p)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)\right] \tag{2.17}$$

In the case of the renormalization technique of section 2.2.1, the ghost is obtained from the original particule by removing the part associated to the first brownian. Then for every $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}^n_T$, the particule dynamic is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
X^k_{T_{k-}+\delta t} :=& X^k_{T_{k-}} + \mu(T_{k-}, X^k_{T_{k-}})\delta t + \\
& \mathbf{1}_{k_n\in\mathbb{N}}\sigma_0(T_{k-}, X^k_{T_{k-}})\hat{W}^{k,1}_{\delta t}, \\
X^k_{T_{k-}+i\delta t} =& X^k_{T_{k-}+(i-1)\delta t} + \mu(T_{k-} + (i-1)\delta t, X^k_{T_{k-}+(i-1)\delta t})\delta t + \\
& \sigma_0(T_{k-} + (i-1)\delta t, X^k_{T_{k-}+(i-1)\delta t})\hat{W}^{k,i}_{\delta t}, \text{ for } i = 2, .., N, \\
X^k_{T_k} =& X^k_{T_{k-}+N\delta t} + \mu(T_{k-} + N\delta t, X^k_{T_{k-}+N\delta t})(\Delta T_k - N\delta t) + \\
& \sigma_0(T_{k-} + N\delta t, X^k_{T_{k-}+N\delta t})\hat{W}^{k,i}_{\Delta T_k - N\delta t},
\end{aligned}$$

if $N > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
X^k_{T_k} :=& X^k_{T_{k-}} + \mu(T_{k-}, X^k_{T_{k-}})\Delta T_k + \\
& \mathbf{1}_{k_n\in\mathbb{N}}\sigma_0(T_{k-}, X^k_{T_{k-}})\hat{W}^{k,1}_{\Delta T_k}
\end{aligned}$$

otherwise.
The renormalization technique of section 2.2.1 leads to the following estimation of the

gradient in equation (2.7):

$$\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\Big[(\sigma_0(T_{(1)},X^{(1)}_{T_{(1)}})^\top)^{-1}\frac{\hat{W}^{(1,p),1}_{\min(\delta t,\Delta T_{(1,p)})}}{\min(\delta t,\Delta T_{(1,p)})}\big(\phi\big(T_{(1,p)},X^{(1,p)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)-\phi\big(T_{(1,p)},X^{(1,p^1)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)\big)\Big]. \tag{2.18}$$

Remark 2.2. *The renormalization technique described for the renormalization technique of section 2.2.1 can be straightforwardly adapted to the renormalization scheme with antithetics of section 2.2.2.*

Of course using equation (2.17) we expect that variance of the scheme will degrade with the diminution of the time step and we expect the scheme (2.18) to correct this behaviour. On figure 11 we give the error estimations given by the original scheme and the renormalization technique (with anithetics of section 2.2.1) depending on the time step for a case with burgers non linearity in dimension 4 with $1e6$ particles: as we refine the time step the scheme (2.17) becomes unusable while the scheme (2.18) gives stable results.


Initial scheme
Log of standard deviation divided by square root of n
-log(time step)
Renormalization scheme
Log of standard deviation divided by square root of n
-log(time step)

Figure 11: A Burgers case in dimension 4 : comparison of Euler schemes error for the original method and the renormalization method.

3 The full non linear case

In order to treat some full non linear case, so with a second order derivative D^2u in f, the re-normalization technique is necessary as no distribution can meet the finite variance requirement even when f is linear in D^2u (see [9]).
Suppose that the f function is as follows :

$$f(t,x,y,z,\gamma) \ := h(t,x)+c(t,x)y^{\ell_0}\prod_{i=1}^{m}\big((b_i\cdot z)^{\ell^1_i}\big)\prod_{i=m+1}^{2m}\big((a_i:\gamma)^{\ell_i}\big),$$

for a given $(\ell_0,\ell_1,\cdot,\ell_m,\ell_{m+1},\cdots,\ell_{2m})\in\mathbb{N}^{1+2m}$, $m\geq 1$, $b_i:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}^d$ for $i=1,\cdots,m$ are bounded continuous, $h:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}$ is a bounded continuous function, and $a_i:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{M}^d$, for $i=m+1,\cdots,2m$ are bounded continuous

functions. We note $L = \sum_{i=0}^{2m} \ell_i$.
We use a similar algorithm to the one proposed in section 2.1.2. Instead of approximating f using representation (2.6), we have to take into account the D^2u term :

$$
\begin{aligned}
[cu^{\ell_0} \prod_{i=1}^{m} (b_i \cdot Du)^{\ell_i^1} \prod_{i=m+1}^{2m} (a_i : D^2u)^{\ell_i}](T_{(1)}, X_{T_{(1)}}) = \\
c \prod_{j=1}^{\ell_0} \mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)}, X_{T_{(1)}}} \left[\phi\big(T_{(1,j)}, X^{(1)}_{T_{(1,j)}}\big)\right] \\
\prod_{i=1}^{m} (b_i(T_{(1)}, X_{T_{(1)}}).D\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)}, X_{T_{(1)}}} \left[\phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X^{(1,p)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)\right])^{\ell_p^1} \\
\prod_{i=m+1}^{2m} (a_i : D^2\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)}, X_{T_{(1)}}} \left[\phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X^{(1,p)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)\right])^{\ell_i}. \qquad (3.1)
\end{aligned}
$$

The terms

$$\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)}, X_{T_{(1)}}} \left[\phi\big(T_{(1,j)}, X^{(1)}_{T_{(1,j)}}\big)\right]$$

and

$$(b_i(T_{(1)}, X_{T_{(1)}}).D\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)}, X_{T_{(1)}}} \left[\phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X^{(1,p)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)\right])$$

are approximated by the different schemes previously seen. It remains to give an approximation of the $(a_i : D^2\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)}, X_{T_{(1)}}} \left[\phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X^{(1,p)}_{T_{(1,p)}}\big)\right] u)$ term.

3.1 Ghost particles of dimension q

We extend the definition given in [11] of ghost tree for the full non linear case. For a particle in dimension (1) of generation $n = 1$, we introduce q associated ghost particles denoted (1^i) for $i = 1, ..., q$. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}^1_T := \{(1), (1^1), ..., (1^q)\}$ Then given the collection $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}^n_T$ of all particles and ghost particles of generation n, we define $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}^{n+1}_T$ as follows. Given $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}^n_T$, we denote by $o(k)$ its original particle; and when $k_n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote $k^i := (k_1, \cdots, k_{n-1}, k^i_n)$ for $i \in [1, q]$ and i is noted the order of k^i. The function κ allows us to give the order of a particle for $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}^n_T$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\kappa(k) = i, \text{ if } k_n = p^i \text{ with } p \in \mathbb{N}, \\
\kappa(k) = 0, \text{ if } k_n = p \text{ with } p \in \mathbb{N},
\end{aligned}
$$

The variables T_k as well as the mark θ_k inherits that of the original particle $o(k)$. Similarly $\Delta T_k = \Delta T_{o(k)}$. Denote also $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}^n_T := \{k \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}^n_T : o(k) \in \mathcal{K}^n_T\}$. For every $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}^n_T \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{K}}^n_T$, we define the collection of its offspring particles by

$$h(k) := \{(k_1, \cdots, k_i, 1), \cdots, (k_1, \cdots, k_i, L)\},$$

and generalizing the definition in section 2.2, we introduce q collections of all offspring ghost particles:

$$S^i(k) \quad := \quad \big\{(k_1, \cdots, k_n, 1^i), \cdots, (k_1, \cdots, k_n, L^i)\big\}, \text{ for } i = 1, ..., q$$

Then the collection $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^{n+1}$ of all particles and ghost particles of generation $n+1$ is given by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^{n+1} \ := \ \cup_{k\in\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^n\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T^n}\big(S(k)\cup S^1(k)\cup\ldots\cup S^q(k)\big).$$

3.2 D^2u approximations

In this section, we give some different schemes that can be used to approximate the D^2u term and that we will compared on some numerical test cases.

3.2.1 The original D^2u approximation

The approximation developed in this paragraph was first proposed in [11] and uses some ghost particle of dimension $q = 2$. To obtained the position of a particle, we freeze its position if its order is 2 and inverse its increment if its order is 1 , so for every $k = (k_1, \cdots, k_n) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T^n$

$$\begin{aligned} W_s^k \ &:= \ W_{T_{k-}}^{k-} \ + \ \mathbf{1}_{\kappa(k)=0}\hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k)} \ - \ \mathbf{1}_{\kappa(k)=1}\hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k)}, \\ &\text{and} \quad X_s^k := \mu s + \sigma_0 W_s^k, \quad \forall s \in [T_{k-}, T_k]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Then we use the following representation for the D^2u term in equation (3.1) :

$$\begin{aligned} &D^2\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[\phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p)}\big)\big] = \\ &\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[(\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\frac{\hat{W}_{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p)}(\hat{W}_{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p)})^\top - \Delta T_{(1,p)}I_d}{(\Delta T_{(1,p)})^2}\sigma_0^{-1}\psi\big], \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$\psi = \frac{1}{2}\big[\phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p)}\big) + \phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p^1)}\big) - 2\phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p^2)}\big)\big].$$

Using for example the equation (2.12) for the first derivative Du, [11] gave the following re-normalized estimator defined by a backward induction: let $\widehat{\psi}_k := \frac{g(X_T^k)}{\overline{F}(\Delta T_k)}$ for every $k \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T$, then let

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\psi}_k \ &:= \ \frac{1}{\rho(\Delta T_k)}\big(h(T_k, X_{T_k}^k) + c(T_k, X_{T_k}^k)\prod_{\tilde{k}\in S(k)}\big(\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}}\mathbf{1}_{\theta(\tilde{k})=0} + (\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}} - \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^2})\mathbf{1}_{1\le\theta(\tilde{k})\le m} + \\ &\frac{1}{2}(\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}} + \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^1} - \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^2})\mathbf{1}_{m+1\le\theta(\tilde{k})\le 2m\}}\big)\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{k}}\big), \quad \text{for } k \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_k := \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_k=0\}} &+ \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_k\in\{1,\cdots,m\}\}}\frac{b_{\theta_k}(T_{k-}, X_{T_{k-}}^k)\cdot(\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\hat{W}_{\Delta T_k}^{o(k)}}{\Delta T_k} \\ + \ \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_k\in\{m+1,\cdots,2m\}\}}a_{\theta_k} &: (\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\frac{\hat{W}_{\Delta T_k}^{o(k)}\hat{W}_{\Delta T_k}^{o(k)} - \Delta T_k I_d}{(\Delta T_k)^2}\sigma_0^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$u(0,x) = \mathbb{E}_{0,x}\Big[\widehat{\psi}_{(1)}\Big].$$

3.3 A second representation

This second representation uses some ghost particle of dimension $q = 3$. Let

$$(\hat{W}^{k,i})_{k=(k_1,\cdots,k_{n-1},k_n)\in\mathbb{N}^n,n>1,i=1,2}$$

be a sequence of independent d-dimensional Brownian motion, which is also independent of $(\Delta T_k)_{k=(k_1,\cdots,k_{n-1},k_n)\in\mathbb{N}^n,n>1}$. The dynamic of the original particles and the ghosts is given by :

$$W_s^k := W_{T_{k-}}^{k-} + \mathbf{1}_{\kappa(k)=0}\frac{\hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k),1} + \hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k),2}}{\sqrt{2}} + \mathbf{1}_{\kappa(k)=1}\frac{\hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k),1}}{\sqrt{2}} + \mathbf{1}_{\kappa(k)=2}\frac{\hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k),2}}{\sqrt{2}}$$
$$\text{and} \quad X_s^k := \mu s + \sigma_0 W_s^k, \quad \forall s \in [T_{k-}, T_k]. \tag{3.5}$$

We then replace (3.3) by

$$D^2\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[\phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p)}\big)\big] = \mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[2(\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\frac{\hat{W}_{\Delta T_k}^{(1,p),1}(\hat{W}_{\Delta T_k}^{(1,p),2})^\top}{(\Delta T_{(1,p)})^2}\sigma_0^{-1}\psi)\big], \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$\psi = \phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p)}\big) + \phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p^3)}\big) - \phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p^1)}\big) - \phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p^2)}\big).$$

This scheme can be can be easily obtained by applying the differentiation rule used for semi linear equations on two successive steps with size $\frac{\Delta T_{(1,p)}}{2}$. A simple calculation shows that the original scheme has a variance bounded by $|D^2u|_\infty^2\frac{39}{2}$ while this one has variance bounded by $|D^2u|_\infty^2 9$ so we expect a diminution of the variance observed with this new scheme.

Remark 3.1. *This derivation on two consecutive time steps has already been used implicitly for example in [6] and already was numerically superior to a scheme directly using second order Malliavin weight.*

Recursively the re-normalized estimator is defined by a backward induction: let $\widehat{\psi}_k := \frac{g(X_T^k)}{\overline{F}(\Delta T_k)}$ for every $k \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T$, then let

$$\widehat{\psi}_k := \frac{1}{\rho(\Delta T_k)}\big(h(T_k, X_{T_k}^k) + c(T_k, X_{T_k}^k)\prod_{\tilde{k}\in S(k)}\big(\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}}\mathbf{1}_{\theta(\tilde{k})=0} + (\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}} - \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^3})\mathbf{1}_{1\le\theta(\tilde{k})\le m} +$$
$$(\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}} + \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^3} - \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^1} - \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^2})\mathbf{1}_{m+1\le\theta(\tilde{k})\le 2m\}})\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{k}}\big), \quad \text{for } k \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T. \tag{3.7}$$

where

$$\mathcal{W}_k := \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_k=0\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_k\in\{1,\cdots,m\}\}}\frac{b_{\theta_k}(T_{k-}, X_{T_{k-}}^k)\cdot(\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\hat{W}_{\Delta T_k}^{o(k),1}}{\Delta T_k}$$
$$+ \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_k\in\{m+1,\cdots,2m\}\}}a_{\theta_k} : 2(\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\frac{\hat{W}_{\Delta T_k}^{o(k),1}\hat{W}_{\Delta T_k}^{o(k),2}}{(\Delta T_k)^2}\sigma_0^{-1}. \tag{3.8}$$

Then we have

$$u(0,x) = \mathbb{E}_{0,x}\Big[\widehat{\psi}_{(1)}\Big].$$

3.4 A third representation

This representation is only the antithetic version of the second one and uses some ghost particle of dimension $q = 6$. The dynamic of the original particles and the ghosts is given by :

$$W_s^k := W_{T_{k-}}^{k-} + \mathbf{1}_{\kappa(k)=0}\frac{\hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k),1} + \hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k),2}}{\sqrt{2}} + \mathbf{1}_{\kappa(k)=1}\frac{\hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k),1}}{\sqrt{2}} + \mathbf{1}_{\kappa(k)=2}\frac{\hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k),2}}{\sqrt{2}} - \mathbf{1}_{\kappa(k)=4}\frac{\hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k),1} + \hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k),2}}{\sqrt{2}} - \mathbf{1}_{\kappa(k)=5}\frac{\hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k),1}}{\sqrt{2}} - \mathbf{1}_{\kappa(k)=6}\frac{\hat{W}_{s-T_{k-}}^{o(k),2}}{\sqrt{2}}$$
$$\text{and } X_s^k := \mu s + \sigma_0 W_s^k, \quad \forall s \in [T_{k-}, T_k]. \tag{3.9}$$

We then replace (3.3) by

$$D^2\mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[\phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p)}\big)\big] = \mathbb{E}_{T_{(1)},X_{T_{(1)}}}\big[(\sigma_0^\top)^{-1}\frac{\hat{W}^{(1,p),1}(\hat{W}^{(1,p),2})^\top}{(\Delta T_{(1,p)})^2}\sigma_0^{-1}\psi)\big], \tag{3.10}$$

where

$$\psi = \phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p)}\big) + 2\phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p^3)}\big) - \phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p^1)}\big) - \phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p^2)}\big) + \phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p^4)}}^{(1,p)}\big) - \phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p^5)}\big) - \phi\big(T_{(1,p)}, X_{T_{(1,p)}}^{(1,p^6)}\big)\big),$$

and the weights are still given by equation (3.8). The backward induction is defined as follows: let $\widehat{\psi}_k := \frac{g(X_T^k)}{\bar{F}(\Delta T_k)}$ for every $k \in \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T$, then let

$$\widehat{\psi}_k := \frac{1}{\rho(\Delta T_k)}\big(h(T_k, X_{T_k}^k) + \frac{c(T_k, X_{T_k}^k)}{2}\prod_{\tilde{k}\in S(k)}\big((\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}} + \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^4})\mathbf{1}_{\theta(\tilde{k})=0} + (\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}} - \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^4})\mathbf{1}_{1\le\theta(\tilde{k})\le m} + \frac{1}{2}(\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}} + 2\widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^3} - \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^1} - \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^2} + \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^4} - \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^5} - \widehat{\psi}_{\tilde{k}^6})\mathbf{1}_{m+1\le\theta(\tilde{k})\le 2m\}}\big)\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{k}}\big), \quad \text{for } k \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}_T \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T. \tag{3.11}$$

where the weights are given by equation (3.8). And as usual we have

$$u(0,x) = \mathbb{E}_{0,x}\Big[\widehat{\psi}_{(1)}\Big].$$

Remark 3.2. *Extension to schemes for derivatives of order more than 3 is obvious with the two last schemes.*

3.5 Numerical results

For all test cases in this section we take $\mu = 0.2\mathbf{1}$, $\sigma_0 = 0.5\mathbb{1}$ and we want to evaluate $u(0, 0.5\mathbf{1})$. We test the 3 schemes previously described :

- Version 1 stands for the original version of the scheme using backward recursion (3.4),

- Version 2 stands for the second representation using second backward recursion (3.7),
- Version 3 stands for the third representation corresponding to the antithetic version of the second representation and using backward recursion (3.11). Notice that in this case all terms in u in f are treated with antithetic ghosts.

We give results for the non nested version as the nested version doesn't improve the results very much.

- We first choose a non linearity

$$f(u, Du, D^2u) = h(t,x) + \frac{0.1}{d} u(\mathbb{1} : D^2u),$$

where $\mu = 0.2\mathbf{1}$, $\sigma_0 = 0.5\mathbb{1}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} h(t,x) =& (\alpha + \frac{\sigma_0^2}{2}) \cos(x_1 + .. + x_d) e^{\alpha(T-t)} + \\ & 0.1 \cos(x_1 + .. + x_d)^2 e^{2\alpha(T-t)} + \mu \sin(x_1 + .. + x_d) e^{\alpha(T-t)}, \end{aligned}$$

with $\alpha = 0.2$. We suppose that the final solution is given by $g(x) = \cos(x_1 + .. + x_d)$ such that the analytical solution is

$$u(t,x) = \cos(x_1 + .. + x_d) e^{\alpha(T-t)}.$$

This test case will be noted test C. In the example we want evaluate $u(0, 0.5\mathbf{1})$. First we take $d = 4$ and give the results obtained for different maturities on figures 12 and 13.



Figure 12: Solution and error obtained in $d = 4$ for test case C with $T = 1$, analytical solution is -0.50828.

We then test in dimension 6 the different schemes on figure 14. Besides on figure 15 we show that the schemes provide a good accuracy for the computation of the derivatives by plotting $(\mathbf{1}.Du)$ for the three versions : as expected the accuracy is however slightly less good than for the function evaluation.



Figure 13: Solution and error obtained in $d = 4$ for test case C with $T = 1.5$, analytical solution is -0.561739.



Figure 14: Solution obtained and error in $d = 6$ for test case C with $T = 1$, analytical solution is -1.20918.



Figure 15: Derivative $(\mathbf{1}.Du)$ obtained and error in $d = 6$ for test case C with $T = 1$.

- At last we consider the test D where $d = 4$, and

$$f(u, Du, D^2u) = 0.0125(\mathbf{1}.DU)(\mathbb{1} : D^2u).$$

We give the solution and error obtained for the 3 methods on figure 16.



Figure 16: Solution and error obtained for $d = 4$ for test case D with $T = 1$.

On all the test cases, the last representation using antithetic variables gives the best result in term of variance reduction but at a price of memory consumption increase: as order of the ghost representation increase so does the memory needed.

4 Conclusion

As the scheme and methods developped here let us extend the maturities than can be used to evaluate the solution of some semi linear and full non linear equation. This is achieved by an increase of the computational time and the memory consumption.

References

[1] Bruno Bouchard, Ivar Ekeland, and Nizar Touzi. On the malliavin approach to monte carlo approximation of conditional expectations. *Finance and Stochastics*, 8(1):45–71, 2004.

[2] Bruno Bouchard and Nizar Touzi. Discrete-time approximation and monte-carlo simulation of backward stochastic differential equations. *Stochastic Processes and their applications*, 111(2):175–206, 2004.

[3] Bruno Bouchard and Xavier Warin. Monte-carlo valuation of american options: facts and new algorithms to improve existing methods. In *Numerical methods in finance*, pages 215–255. Springer, 2012.

[4] Patrick Cheridito, H Mete Soner, Nizar Touzi, and Nicolas Victoir. Second-order backward stochastic differential equations and fully nonlinear parabolic pdes. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 60(7):1081–1110, 2007.

[5] Mahamadou Doumbia, Nadia Oudjane, and Xavier Warin. Unbiased monte carlo estimate of stochastic differential equations expectations. *to appear in ESAIM P&S*, 2017.

[6] Arash Fahim, Nizar Touzi, and Xavier Warin. A probabilistic numerical method for fully nonlinear parabolic pdes. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, pages 1322–1364, 2011.

[7] Eric Fournié, Jean-Michel Lasry, Jérôme Lebuchoux, Pierre-Louis Lions, and Nizar Touzi. Applications of malliavin calculus to monte carlo methods in finance. *Finance and Stochastics*, 3(4):391–412, 1999.

[8] Emmanuel Gobet, Jean-Philippe Lemor, and Xavier Warin. A regression-based monte carlo method to solve backward stochastic differential equations. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 15(3):2172–2202, 2005.

[9] Pierre Henry-Labordere, Nadia Oudjane, Xiaolu Tan, Nizar Touzi, and Xavier Warin. Branching diffusion representation of semilinear pdes and monte carlo approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.01727*, 2016.

[10] Pierre Henry-Labordere, Xiaolu Tan, and Nizar Touzi. Unbiased simulation of stochastic differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.06107*, 2015.

[11] Pierre Henri Labordère, Xiaolu Tan, Nizar Touzi, and Xavier Warin. Truncation and renormalization techniques for solving the nonlinear pdes by branching processes, 2017.

[12] Jean-Philippe Lemor, Emmanuel Gobet, and Xavier Warin. Rate of convergence of an empirical regression method for solving generalized backward stochastic differential equations. *Bernoulli*, 12(5):889–916, 2006.

[13] Etienne Pardoux and Shige Peng. Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation. *Systems & Control Letters*, 14(1):55–61, 1990.

[14] Jianfeng Zhang. A numerical scheme for bsdes. *the annals of applied probability*, 14(1):459–488, 2004.